



uropean press continued to focus on the media coverage of the war in Iraq. Several papers probed the

significance of the growing anti-war protests across the world.

France's Liberation notes that media coverage of the growing US and British casualty toll is posing a problem for the leaders of the two countries. The illusion of a clean, rapid and surgical war - a 'Six-Day War' of the 21st century - vanished into thin air

"On the fourth day, the war - the real one - is inviting itself via the TV screens into American and British living rooms," the paper says. Switzerland's Tribune De Geneve says "the face of the war changed" when the images of killed Iraqi civilians and the bodies of American soldiers and prisoners of war were shown on Iraqi TV on Sunday. "This is how the illusion of a clean, rapid and surgical war - a 'Six-Day War' of the 21st century vanished into thin air," it says.

"The United States is in fact caught in a fearsome dilemma" adds Liberation.

On the one hand, it wants to avoid heavy human losses in urban areas in order to show it is waging a war of liberation, the paper explains.

"But on the other hand it wants to get over with the war as quickly as possible as Bush knows that time is not on his side and any signs of stagnation could be fatal for him.' The Americans and the British are discovering that the price of victory will be higher than their leaders and their media had led them to hope, the paper concludes.

Germany's Der Tagesspiegel compares the coverage by "the two global media players": CNN and the BBC. The paper argues that CNN offers the world an American perspective while the BBC gives voice to a broader range of comment "from all sides and countries"

"Post-empire Britain has developed its global colonial broadcaster to the point where it could almost be called UN TV," it says, "while the former colony America remains focused on itself." The only thing that is certain is that there are three wars and three realities But it adds that, as a result of their rivalry, both broadcasters "benefit and learn from each other"

human losses in urban areas in order to show it is waging a war of liberation, the paper explains. "But on the other hand it wants to

get over with the war as quickly as possible as Bush knows that time is not on his side and any signs of stagnation could be fatal for him." The Americans and the British are discovering that the price of victory will be higher than their leaders and their media had led them to hope, the paper concludes.

In a commentary entitled "War of words at home" Berlin's Die Welt criticises the German media's coverage. The headlines such as "Baghdad's burning", "Bombing terror for freedom" and "Bush plays with fire", "announce a planned break with civilization before it is



"but at present public opinion mercilessly reveals the extent to which positive views of America have melted away." To express one's own opinion loudly has not yet become natural in the Czech Republic

The Czech Hospodarske Noviny daily says a large majority of Czechs who disagree with the war have stayed away from the peace rallies. The daily puts it down to a general attitude to public life. "To express one's own opinion loudly has not yet become natural in the Czech Republic, let alone to join those who. organize such events," it says. "It will take a long time before thousands of Czechs come out to squares to protest against something which they do not perceive as a danger to their own freedom," the paper predicts.

The Ukrainian weekly Kievskiy Telegraf says "the growth of anti-American sentiment all around the world is inevitable"

The victory of arms will hardly be final, and the war so loftily called 'Iraqi Freedom' will continue in other forms. It will continue not just on Iraqi territory but all around the world - everywhere where there are

even remotely possible to arrive at a reliable view of what is really happening in Iraq", it says. "Until there is proof to the

contrary," it says, "we have to believe the protestations by the most civilized fighting force on earth that it knows what it is doing and that it is doing what it is saying: avoiding civilian casualties, sparing the infrastructure, defeating a terrible regime and not the people under its yoke."

Le Figaro, Paris, on war with Iraq: In a few days, perhaps a few hours, weapons will speak ... If the American President triumphs quickly in Baghdad, public opinion, as versatile as it is spontaneous, will view him differently. What then will one remember from the long months leading up to the military offensive?

Of course, the debate on the alleged legality, or illegality, of this war. Resolution 1441, adopted last November by the United Nations, demands disarmament of Iraq by weapons inspections. The resolution does not implicitly evoke war, nor does it call for the defeat of Saddam's regime. International law has only a relative value: it can do nothing against force

versus Chirac the traitor, Chirac the friend of Saddam ...

Chirac's pacifism is no more absolute than Bush's bellicosity: without the September 11 attacks. the President of the United States undoubtedly would not have initiated a war.

Algemeen Dagblad, Rotterdam, on President Bush and war with Iraq:

In defiance of opposing views in his own country and everywhere else. Bush is religiously convinced war is the only remedy against the dictator of Baghdad. The theatrical negotiations in the U.N. security council, sharply waged, appear in retrospect to have had little meaning. It is disturbing that the U.N. only matters to Bush when it goes along with the plan-making in Washington, and is otherwise shoved aside as meaningless. This arrogant attitude, more than the conflict over how to disarm Saddam, explains the distance in large parts of the globe and the division in Europe. But Washington doesn't feel responsible for the consequences.

However sad this all is, it can't be seen as a big surprise. Ever since Bush became president after an unconvincing election result, he has been surrounded with advisers who can't be told anything by the outside world. The big question is what they will put on the agenda after Iraq: North Korea, Iran or other minor annovances America wants to deal with

The Daily Telegraph, London, on the U.N. backing the war with Iraq :

The argument today should not turn on the precise role of the United Nations in the move to war. Despite Robin Cook's eloquent assertions, it is not true that a second U.N. resolution is essential under international law. Several wars since 1945 have been fought legitimately with far less U.N. backing than this one. The role of the U.N. should now be to work to build the new Iraq that will follow the fall of Saddam. ... Ours is the only European country in the postwar era which has never shirked its obligation to try to preserve peace in the world and defend the interests of the West against its enemies. If we slink away now, we will suffer much more than the relatively minor catastrophe of losing a prime minister: we will be weak and friendless, and we ought to be ashamed.

For Liberation it's a diplomatic fiasco for Washington, London and the UN. The paper says 74% of French public approves of President Jacques Chirac.

Le Monde says the past 7 days have seen the US isolated within the international community. The paper says President Chirac has kept most of the right wing with him and has won over the left with his anti war stance.

On its inside pages Le Monde quotes by name a US soldier waiting to go to battle in Iraq who says he agrees with the French view that the diplomatic approach should not be abandoned at this stage - most of his colleagues didn't agree with him, it seems.

Le Monde runs a piece called 'The real reasons for George Bush's war' It quotes the New York Times as saying - 'this is a war of choice not

revealed by neither.

"The only thing that is certain," it says, "is that there are three wars and three realities: the official US army and CNN war/reality; the Arab TV channel war/reality; and then above all the war/reality of the population and of soldiers in Iraq."

In a commentary entitled "War of words at home" Berlin's *Die Welt* criticises the German media's coverage. The headlines such as "Baghdad's burning", "Bombing terror for freedom" and "Bush plays with fire", "announce a planned break with civilization before it is even remotely possible to arrive at a reliable view of what is really happening in Iraq", it says.

"Until there is proof to the contrary," it says, "we have to believe the protestations by the most civilized fighting force on earth that it knows what it is doing and that it is doing what it is saying: avoiding civilian casualties, sparing the infrastructure, defeating a terrible regime and not the people under its yoke."

Germany's Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung describes the protests as "impressive" and says they are a sign of growing mistrust of the United States. "The morality and legitimacy of this war may be judged differently once the regime of the Iraqi dictator has collapsed and the nature of his rule comes to light," the paper says, bloody."

But Belgium's *De Standaard* looks ahead. It warns against "a position of moral purity", which it says only hampers preparations for the postwar period. "In the service of peace, the task is not to climb as high an ethical mountain as possible in order to look down from there on the miscreants who use violence."

"When no more American planes fly over our country and no more military convoys embark in Antwerp? Or when the last American diplomat has left our territory? Or when nobody buys products made in the USA any more? Or when?," the paper asks.

France's *Liberation* notes that media coverage of the growing US and British casualty toll is posing a problem for the leaders of the two countries. "On the fourth day, the war - the real one - is inviting itself via the TV screens into American and British living rooms," the paper says.

Switzerland's *Tribune De Geneve* says "the face of the war changed" when the images of killed Iraqi civilians and the bodies of American soldiers and prisoners of war were shown on Iraqi TV on Sunday. "This is how the illusion of a clean, rapid and surgical war - a 'Six-Day War' of the 21st century - vanished into thin air," it says. "The United States is in fact caught in a fearsome common energy was not detailed of Baghdad. From both sides of the Atlantic, the media had harsh words for each of the presidents. Bush the Ofstander, Bush the simple-minded,

suffered acute damage to some

